UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Home Consciousness As an Aid to a World View - - - - *Edith Hansen*

The Challenge of People Versus Food - - - - - - - - - *Gordon Caulfeild*

The "Hundred Great Books" Fallacy - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

We Strengthen Each Other - - - - - - - - - - *Sheldon Shephard*

Our Decadent Christian Sex Morality - - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Aristotle - - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXV NUMBER 4

Chicago, September-October, 1949

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of The Third Unitarian Church, Chicago.

Gordon Caulfeild: Contributor to various rationalist journals.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

Thaddeus B. Clark: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis, Missouri.

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of The First Congregational Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

Edith Hansen: Free lance journalist.

Sheldon Shephard: President of the California Universalist Convention.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 63

ARTICLES—

Home Consciousness As an Aid to a World View—EDITH HANSEN 64

The Challenge of People Versus Food—GORDON CAULFEILD 67

The "Hundred Great Books" Fallacy—VICTOR S. YARROS 68

We Strengthen Each Other—SHELDON SHEPHARD 70

Our Decadent Christian Sex Morality—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 71

Aristotle—LEONARD B. GRAY 73

THE STUDY TABLE—

America's Debt to Paul Blanshard—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 77

CORRESPONDENCE—

Dr. Clark Responds to Editorial—THADDEUS B. CLARK 78

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 79

THE FIELD—

Iron Curtain Barbs—*Worldover Press* 62

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Iron Curtain Barbs

Along 233 miles of the Austrian-Hungarian frontier, from the border of Czechoslovakia to the border of Yugoslavia, the Iron Curtain in recent weeks has been developing barbs and other dangerous devices to prevent the escape of refugees fleeing from Soviet-dominated soil to the west.

At points where crossing is allowed, heavy guards are now posted. Where legal routes do not exist, the frontier has been equipped with barbed-wire fencing, watchtowers with strong searchlights which send their beams nearly a mile into Austrian territory, and even minefields.

Behind the fence the countryside has been cleared of all trees and high bushes, to make observation as easy as possible. Anyone crossing the line illegally will find himself setting off small explosive charges and illumination rockets to attract the attention of guards.

Recently the Hungarian government tried to get the government of Austria to clear the land on the Austrian side of the frontier in a strip 164 feet deep, and to prohibit the planting of fruits or vegetables taller than potatoes. Even the growing of grain was to be forbidden. The Austrians refused to comply. It remains to be seen whether the Soviet occupation authorities will compel the clearing of the strip as a measure "necessary for the safety of Russian troops."

Since Hungary and Austria belonged for many centuries to the Hapsburg Empire, there are numerous peasants who own land on both sides of the frontier. Until the arrival of the so-called "people's democracies," these landowners could work their lands on both sides, without restrictions. The border was open its entire length, and there were 66 official crossing places where travelers could get their passports stamped and have their luggage examined by customs agents.

Of these 66 crossing points, 53 are now closed by the barbed-wire fence. Of the remaining ones, four are open for general traffic, five serve for the crossing of interna-

(*Continued on page 76*)

UNITY

Volume CXXXV SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1949 No. 4

EDITORIAL

There is a good chance that Lanny Budd will become President of the United States. Upton Sinclair has intimated as much in a letter published in the Saturday Review of Literature, and Lanny Budd fans are urging it. The prospect of an administration under the guidance of a man with such an unusual experience is intriguing. He knows the psychology of dictators and how to outwit them. He has hobnobbed with all sorts of people and he understands what motivates them. As a rule we have elected as Presidents men who had some knowledge, or thought they did, of domestic affairs, but were utterly lacking in knowledge of international affairs. It will be a happy experience to have as President a man who is already thoroughly familiar with the international scene and not unacquainted with the domestic scene. The big business connections of his father have not blinded him to the social trends of modern economy. He is intelligently venturesome. He possesses status, and consequently will not be concerned about what small-time politicians think of him. He will take the Square Deal, the New Deal, and the Fair Deal, bring them to fruition, and add a few shuffles of his own. His aesthetic interests will add lustre to the White House. And his skill in international intelligence will enable him to lift the F. B. I. and Central Intelligence to new levels of operation. He knows the devious ways of intrigue and can spot the subversive on sight. He will surround himself with cabinets, both the regular and the kitchen variety, composed of men who know history, who discern the times, and who will move fearlessly toward planned goals. He will keep the ideal well in mind, but he will not let the ideal stand in the way of the possible. He is cosmopolitan in the best sense of the term, and he will not be influenced by bigots, racialists, or narrow nativists. Living in Washington will be hard on him, but it is safe to predict that his administration will change the social climate of that provincial capital. No doubt Upton Sinclair will be his chief consultant, and this will guarantee integrity in administration, social vision in legislation, and wisdom in judicial appointments. His administration will come at a time when the world needs leadership of a high quality, and while America still has the power to lead. Let the inauguration proceed! Hail to the Chief, Lanny Budd, President of the United States!

Curtis W. Reese.

Home Consciousness As an Aid to a World View

EDITH HANSEN

Internationalism as a dominant emphasis and starting point for a World View was urged upon a group of women in my county by a specialist in internationalism. Instead of beginning with local concerns and working up to international outlooks, we should begin with an international outlook and work down to local problems and responsibilities. But I have to develop my World View from where I am geographically, mentally, and emotionally located.

I am home conscious. The affairs of my family and house are my primary concern. My family, community, county, and metropolitan area are my chief sources of realistic understanding of human behavior, needs, and aspirations. I have a vivid consciousness of belonging to them. Apart from them, I should not be I. Yet I aspire to a World View. My purpose in this article is to explain a few present convictions regarding the relationship of home consciousness to a World View, in the hope that some readers will make criticisms and suggestions. Home consciousness seems to me especially helpful for appreciation of the following emphases in a World View: universality; faith that human incompatibilities threatening world peace can be accommodated through democratic organization; valuing people for their own sakes; and need for patience and persistence.

Home conscious people have psychological opportunity for development of universality in their thinking. Family, home, and community are universal institutions. They nurture the will to live—a universal human urge. Cooperation — a universally necessary principle—is their basis. Many needs, desires, and aspirations which they foster and try to satisfy are universal.

Home conscious people can appreciate the bases on which universality in world organization can be achieved. At a forum on world organization held in my county by the Federated Women's Clubs, the chairman commented impulsively that it ought to be possible for the women of the world to get together to discuss recipes for pickles and puddings! Recipes for the satisfying of universal physical and spiritual hungers are being worked out in the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and other United Nations organizations and Specialized Agencies, and in many non-governmental organizations. Jane Addams suggested many years ago, in her book *Peace and Bread* (1922), that the community of nations might develop through world cooperation on the basis of basic human needs rather than through political arrangements. Sir John Boyd Orr, in July 16, 1949, *Nation*, emphasized that "a world community of nations must evolve by the development of common interests." At the International Congress on Population and World Resources in Relation to the Family, held in Cheltenham, England, August, 1948, he referred to the autumn, 1947, meeting of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers: "People from Communist countries, Socialist countries, and Capitalist countries discussed matters there for a week and reached complete agreement on what farmers should do and what their responsibilities were, hoping that they would be able to encourage governments to carry out schemes put forward by the FAO." (Proceedings of the International Congress on Population and World Resources in Relation to the Family.)

Achieving of peace "through promotion of the common interests of humanity by organized international action is already far advanced." This reality was stated by Mr. Lyman C. White, Secretary, Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, ECOSOCO, at the 1949 annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. "This great movement has developed so rapidly during recent decades that it is probably safe to say that the amount of organized international activity today is fully 100 times greater than it was in 1910 and ten times greater now than in 1930." "The United Nations is based upon common interests," Mr. White pointed out, "and the understanding that organized means are necessary for their promotion." And "international non-governmental organizations, by building up the organization of interests on a world basis, exert a profound influence toward world unity." He urged the importance of recognizing the value of the "non-governmental international mind, which leads one to think of the relations among groups of people of different nationalities and how they may promote their common interests." "It is there that one finds the most positive and constructive elements working for world unity. . . . We have been so concerned with the troublemakers that we have failed to see this great area of cooperation which has grown to such enormous importance during the past few decades." There is reason for hope "when we realize that in a few short years the machinery for dealing with almost every conceivable international common need on both the governmental and the non-governmental level has been created." There are now more than one thousand international organizations, about nine hundred of which are non-governmental. "To establish peace, we must look for these common needs and devote ourselves to their promotion." "If a world government should ever be established, it will be largely through the efforts of these international non-governmental organizations . . .which are bringing about the underlying community of organized interests without which no form of international cooperation can succeed."

Related to the development of universality through cooperative effort in behalf of common needs and interests, is the development of opportunity for all peoples and even individuals to make their particular needs and opinions known. Valiant effort is being made by a number of specialists in internationalism to persuade members of ECOSOCO, UNESCO, and other UN organizations to view problems from standpoints of the well-being of all the world's people. Community experience causes me to conclude that widely inclusive concern for human welfare is a specialized power of some individuals rather than an attainable attitude of leaders in general. Most people, including most leaders,

are keenly conscious of their own needs and of the needs of their own people. They are psychologically unable to achieve complete universality of understanding. But world leaders can provide universality of opportunity within world organizations for people to seek help. It is democratic for people to speak for themselves. Furthermore, how can even the most universal minds understand the special needs of people everywhere in even a limited field of human living? My husband tried to save our lawn during a dry spell this summer by watering it each evening from the community water supply. Then we and all other families received a request from the management to limit our watering to certain hours. People in elevated sections had been having difficulty in getting even household water. These people had made their needs known to the central organization, and through the central organization all the community received some education in concern for the common good.

Trygve Lie, in his Introduction to the Third Annual Report of the United Nations, mentioned the right of colonial subjects to make oral petitions before the Trusteeship Council as an encouragement to the people of Africa to hope for help and justice. Dr. Charles Malik, rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, in the *United Nations Bulletin,* July 1, 1949, expressed the following opinion regarding the issue of the right of individuals, groups, and organizations to enter complaints initiating proceedings against violations of human rights:

> The reality of an internationally granted right carries with it the right to complain, not only before your state, but also before the international community, if that right should, in fact, turn out to be unreal. Unless and until this right of petition is recognized, there is not enough seriousness in this field, and the individual is not really regarded the *subject* of human rights.

Community experience encourages in me faith that human incompatibilities threatening world peace can be accommodated through democratic organization, including the organizations suited to common needs. People who participate in community organizations know that it is continuously necessary to deal with human incompatibilities. Yet it does not occur to most people in most American communities to try to settle conflicts or avenge wrongs by physical fighting and killing. They are not in the habit of doing so. It would not be to their advantage. The idea has not been cultivated in them. But many do relieve themselves verbally, and especially orally. Such relief seems to be a quite general human need. Some problems are solved through argument. Some are kept postponed. The emotional relief found in argument makes many an intolerable situation tolerable. Certain it is, too, that some of us enjoy verbal fighting. A leader of an international organization, after visiting a United Nations meeting at Lake Success, commented upon the adolescent argument as a bad psychological approach to world problems. But Warren R. Austin, as quoted in the *United Nations Bulletin,* June 1, 1949, has a different view:

> We have had a hard-fought session. (General Assembly.) We have been through some very difficult issues, and there have been expressed from this platform some sharp disagreements among us. That is all right; that is the purpose of this Organization—to bring us together so that we can work out our differences. We have seen the United Nations tackle even top problems of peace settlements and bring to bear the conflicting views of fifty-nine independent nations in working for, but failing to arrive at, constructive solutions. The future, Mr. President, can and will see the service of the United Nations to the cause of peace grow in scope and effectiveness so long as we can rise from such deliberations as this and say, despite our differences, we are still the United Nations.

In any community organization there is usually at least one strong-willed domineering person. Usually also there are a few persons with talent for achieving workable agreement and for making headway in spite of conflict. An organization which succeeds in including all citizens interested in a specific purpose, no matter how much they disagree among themselves, can survive and be of value. If a faction withdraws, the organization may be seriously hampered by uninhibited attacks. It is better for the organization to be goaded from within than to be destroyed from without.

Community life illustrates in its public services that people who dislike each other's viewpoints and ways, cooperate readily for practical purposes when there are advantageous systems of cooperation. In my county, regular Republicans, Independent Republicans, Progressives, Democrats, Socialists, Communists, free enterprisers, advocates of the welfare state, members of unions, and people who feel racial or religious antagonisms use the same trolleys, busses, water supply, telephone service, and giant markets. This cooperation helps me, in a measure, to appreciate an opinion expressed by Mr. White in his address: that there would have been no Civil War if the railroads had run north and south as well as east and west, North-South trade been developed, and interests organized on a national rather than on a sectional basis. Conflicts between functional interests organized nationally must be political rather than military, he pointed out. It is on this same process that we must rely, he believes, to unify the world. Democracy, as a creative force, may be able to accommodate antagonisms in world organization to a greater degree than people of good will have realized. More emphasis should be placed on democratic processes and forms of organization which can accommodate antagonistic ideologies, points of view, opinions, and willful, bigoted, irascible human beings. No matter what the political and economic affiliations of people may be, they can learn to value democratic methods and processes by using them. And when democracy and creative peace are rooted in the habits of people, they grow at every favorable opportunity. Faith that democracy and peace can grow in a world of turmoil and ferment, with radical differences and countless variances of viewpoint, seems to me the faith that is most needed. Such faith encourages universality of representation in world organization. This is psychologically more feasible than universality of understanding and good will.

Vera Micheles Dean, director of research for the Foreign Policy Association, in May-June, 1949, report of the association's Headline Series, states her belief that the United Nations does its most valuable work in its committees and associated international agencies in which "men and women of widely differing political, economic, and social outlook and tradition learn through actual experience to fuse their thoughts and actions into practical international cooperation." Leland M. Goodrich, chairman of the board of editors of *International Organization,* in an article in February, 1949, *American Perspective,* gave this opinion: "The strength of the United Nations, then, in the present troubled world, is that through the flexibility of its arrangements it permits a wide range of effective cooperation between its members." Secretary-General Trygve Lie, in the

Introduction to his Fourth Annual Report to the General Assembly, said:

> It was never contemplated at San Francisco that the United Nations would or could abolish differences of interest and ideology such as we see in the world today. It was not believed that the great Powers would always act in unity and brotherhood together. What the founders of the United Nations did believe was that the United Nations would make it possible to keep disputes between both great and small Powers within peaceful bounds, and that without the United Nations this could not be done. Finally, they rejected the idea of an irreconcilable conflict that could be settled only on the field of battle, and proclaimed on the contrary the principle that all conflicts, no matter how fundamental, should and could be settled by peaceful means. The record of the United Nations during the past twelve months has clearly confirmed the wisdom of the San Francisco concept, rather than cast doubt upon it. The United Nations has not been able to resolve great Power differences, but the conflict has been kept within peaceful bounds and the way prepared for further progress toward a settlement. In the meantime the work of the United Nations has gone right ahead; it has stopped wars in different parts of the world; it has developed international cooperation in almost every field of human activity on a scale never before attempted.

Specialists in internationalism tend to emphasize prevention of war as a motive for international cooperative efforts. This emphasis is necessitated by the vast and fierce struggles of governments and privately organized people for political and economic power. Both the struggles and the emphasis cause neglect of some peoples and some important human needs. Home conscious men and women, accustomed to feeling responsibility for specific individuals, can contribute to the Collective World View emphasis upon the intrinsic importance of people. A number of ways in which this contribution of emphasis may be made or attempted seem to me important. We can help inform our communities about the work of world organizations devoted primarily to the well-being of people. Active participation and influence by ordinary American citizens can be developed to a much greater degree. Information about the United Nations Organizations and the Specialized Agencies named in the first part of this article, and about the Trusteeship Council, the Social Commission, the International Labor Organization, and other committees, commissions, and departments established to help people can be obtained from the Department of Public Information, United Nations, Lake Success. Mr. Lyman C. White, secretary of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, ECOSOCO Secretariat, sent me a copy of his address on non-governmental organizations and a list of the present Consultative Non-Governmental Organizations. I am sure that he would send copies to other interested persons.

Home conscious people can give support to world efforts for which the help of the public is sought. To illustrate, money contributions for UNICEF may be sent to UN Children's Fund Committee, New York 16. Home conscious Americans concerned for American support of the convention against genocide and of human rights covenants can aid these causes by joining the American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Ave., New York 10, and asking to be placed on the International Bill of Rights list. Information will then be sent regarding the right moments to write to United States senators.

The situations of neglected or wronged peoples should be studied with a view to learning how they may be helped through world organization. Community experience makes their situations understandable to me. Negro families in my county are cruelly restricted in living space and in the kinds of houses available to them. White people, except a very few, are ignorant and indifferent regarding deplorable conditions for which our greed is in considerable measure responsible. In my township of about 65,000 inhabitants, Negroes may live only as servants except in a small slum. Our township now boasts the largest garden type village in the East—a new project—with mortgages protected by the Federal Housing Administration. No Negroes may live in it. We have in our county a medium-sized slum occupied by the families of Negro carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, lathers, cement finishers, hod carriers, shipyard workers, janitors, and junk collectors. Many of the women are domestic workers. Most of the houses are sub-standard. Many of them are utterly unfit for habitation. There is no taxable wealth for the financing of sewers, garbage collection, decent school buildings, adequate school supplies, or health services for the children. White people, who benefit by the labor of the adults, have forced them and their families into an economically worthless bit of the county. Rayford W. Logan prophesied in the November, 1948, issue of *American Perspective,* that "the future of the dependent territories will be determined more decisively by world politics than by provisions of the United Nations charter and by concerted international action." But he believes that the trusteeship system may prove superior to the mandate system. And he believes that the statistical and technical information relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in colonies transmitted by the colonial powers to the Secretary-General of the United Nations may ultimately accelerate self-government. The Social Commission of the United Nations, in its fourth session, considered the fact that too much attention had been paid to commercial and economic possibilities in under-developed countries and not enough to the lives of the people concerned. (*Work of the Social Commission,* Dr. W. B. Sutch, *United Nations Bulletin,* June 15, 1949.) Reports of the work of the Trusteeship Council in the August 1, 1949, and August 15, 1949, issues of the *United Nations Bulletin* are encouraging. It would be worth while for home conscious people to try to interest their organizations in the work of the Trusteeship Council. National and international organizations can exert influence for extension of the trusteeship principle. Trygve Lie has recommended in the Introduction to his Fourth Annual Report that the former Italian colonies be placed under a direct UN trusteeship with an administrator responsible solely to the Trusteeship Council. "I feel sure," states the Introduction, "that such a bold forward step would help the peoples of the territories concerned to follow the peaceful path towards self-government or independence, and that it would strengthen the confidence of dependent peoples all over the world in the United Nations and in the Member Governments who have made such a solution possible." Home conscious people can directly and through their organizations urge the United States government to carry out the programs of technical assistance for the economic development of underdeveloped areas through the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. The peoples of these areas will be protected and helped to a far greater extent through the United Nations than through independent action of the government and business organizations of the United States.

Home conscious people can aid development of a worldwide cooperative effort for conservation of natural resources and for public education in voluntary population limitation. Present sources of information include these: *Road to Survival,* book by William Vogt; his article in July 23, 1949, *Saturday Evening Post; Man and Food the Lost Equation?,* Foreign Policy Association brochure, by C. Lester Walker and Blair Bolles; Scripps Foundation, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; and American Committee of the International Population and World Resources Program, Margaret Sanger Research Bureau, 17 West 16th St., New York 11. Men and women who have struggled for the lives and well-being of children of their own cannot accept starvation, disease, and war as permanent and increasing ways of keeping populations reduced. We cannot contemplate the threat of physical starvation for our descendants and the spiritual starvation, affecting them more seriously than us, that are resulting from destruction of natural resources of food, beauty, and interest, without bestirring ourselves to do something constructive. We must help to conserve the right to value human beings and the worth and dignity of the individual. We must help to save humanitarianism. Our children and grandchildren can afford to nourish their humanitarian impulses only if we make a great and highly intelligent effort to combat the terrible threats of diminishing natural resources and mounting populations. I learned from my dictionary that the first part of the word *ecology* is derived from a Greek word meaning *house.* The earth is man's house or home, and home consciousness takes on new and enlarged meaning. Growth in understanding of the earth as our home and of our responsibilities regarding our relationships to it is growth in a supremely important phase of a World View. Regarding our own country, Mr. Vogt says:

> We have been skidding down the road toward national suicide by destroying the environment that permits our survival; a reversal of our direction is unthinkable in any but democratic terms. Here may well be the most fruitful opportunity democracy has ever had.

Potential survival power of democracy exists in the imaginations and wills of home conscious Americans. Regarding the great poverty-stricken, over-populated areas of the world, Frank Lorimer, professor of sociology, the American University, Washington, D. C., said at the International Congress on Population and World Resources in Relation to the Family, at Cheltenham, England, August, 1948:

> Fortunately, many constructive approaches to the appalling problem of mass poverty are complementary to one another. The introduction of new industries, the promotion of improved methods of agricultural production, the extension and intensification of education, the promotion of planned parenthood, the rise of popular political movements, and the formation of new types of social organization are complementary lines of positive advance.

Mr. Vogt made two specific suggestions in his *Saturday Evening Post* article: the inclusion of voluntary population limitation programs in health programs for undeveloped areas, and the setting up within the UN framework of some sort of Resources Protective Board. This Board would make repeated spot checks at the request of the governments of countries in which developmental projects were being carried out. "It should summon the best scientific knowledge available, and its reports should be made public." Means and possibilities for organized national, international, and popular world effort, such as have never before existed, are at hand. Home conscious Americans can undertake to influence national and international organizations and our government to do the things that need to be done.

Home conscious, community-minded people know that most efforts of value require time, persistence, and patience. I have a friend, a Negro woman, who lives in the slum which I have described. Her husband is often sick, having a heart ailment which is aggravated by too heavy manual labor, the only kind of work available to him as a Negro. My friend does housework by the day to help earn a living for four children, her husband, and herself. Besides homemaking and earning, she is ably and creatively active in community improvement efforts and in county efforts for democratic community living. When I expressed admiration of her never-failing morale in her community and county work, she said, "A woman with a family has to be used to discouragement." *Changing World,* bulletin of the American Association for the United Nations, in its May, 1949, issue, contains an address by Ralph J. Bunche in which there is this expression of faith: "The United Nations, by dint of ever-persistent effort, is slowly moulding the kind of peaceful and free world that you and I wish to live in and wish to hand down to our children and grandchildren." Home conscious people can share this faith and be active in its fulfilment, knowing that, as Jane Addams wrote in *Peace and Bread,* "nothing could be worse than the fear that one had given up too soon, had left one effort unexpended which might have helped the world."

The Challenge of People Versus Food

GORDON CAULFEILD

We hear a great deal today about there being too little food for the hungry people of our world. But we do not hear half enough about the fact that, although our food resources are hopelessly inadequate now and are hardly being increased at all, twenty million more people are being added to the total population of the world every single year. So the simple truth is that there are millions too many babies being born today, babies who will be condemned to pitiful and heart-rending lives of hunger or to actual starvation.

The facts and figures I am using here are those of Guy Irving Burch, the Director of the Population Reference Bureau in Washington City, and it seems to me that they are most especially important for all thinking persons. For only thinking people will have the courage to face this issue properly and to lay part of the blame squarely where it belongs: with the anti-birth control policy of the Church of Rome.

It is difficult to realize the appalling truth that, even in what people are pleased to call "normal times," two thirds of our world's human beings suffer from actual undernourishment. For today there simply is not nearly enough food to go around. Furthermore, it is estimated that between twenty and thirty million human

beings in the world die every year quite unnecessarily and solely from lack of proper and adequate food and health and medical care. Of course these figures do not consider new agricultural production possibilities of the future. But they do deal with today's stark realities.

Nor did the last dreadful war even partially solve this problem through killing off people. For, while this senseless war killed over twenty million people as well as wasting vast supplies of vital natural resources and tremendous means of production, there was still such an over-all world population increase that, according to Guy Burch, the demand for these supplies has gone up almost seven per cent. Which means that a great many more millions of our fellow humans must now go forever hungry.

Says Guy Burch:

> The welfare of mankind is balanced on the two great realities of birth and death. It cannot be too often emphasized that where low living conditions and increasing numbers push a hungry people toward starvation, relief which lowers death rates without a corresponding lowering of birth rates must in the end compound disaster.

In this connection let us consider, for example, India. Today in that country one out of every four babies dies in the first two years of life. Yet if the people of India were to go on having so many babies and those babies were to receive sufficient food and other care to enable them all to survive, within only a hundred years India's population would be at least twelve billion—five times the whole earth's present total.

And this is the potential threat of merely one single country to the world's food resources and over-all human security.

Plainly the problem is one of humane and intelligent population limitation. That the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of such an important consideration as this, should go on encouraging its followers to pour forth millions of children and that it should blindly and sweepingly condemn all rational birth control merely through some petty whim of its own, seems to me monstrous. The Church is, in effect, guilty of the most inhuman cruelty to millions of little children, condemning them to lives of starvation.

We must realize this. As I say, we are the only ones who will. While Martha Morrow interviewed Guy Burch in the well-known American weekly science magazine, *Science News Letter,* of course, she made and he made not the least mention of the most obvious implications against the Roman Catholic Church. Popular science journals, like the press, must bow to Catholic pressure against realistic presentation of news and information. So I certainly hope Guy Burch's facts and figures prove of real value to all thinking persons, for only such people today in our society will give these vital facts and figures the true and full publicity they so rightly deserve.

In this respect, readers will find the Penguin Book, *Human Breeding and Survival,* by Guy Irving Burch and Elmer Pendell, of real interest and value.

Guy Burch recommends that a realistic program of population limitation be developed by our nations as a whole. And here the peoples of our earth are most fortunate that so outstanding a biologist and Humanist as Julian Huxley has served as the Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The significance of these facts and figures now given here may be realized from the fact that, following the recent publication of this article in humanist journals here in America and in Australia and New Zealand, Julian Huxley wrote to tell me of being especially glad to have this article, as he is personally much interested in this issue, and hoped that it could be included in UNESCO's future program.

The "Hundred Great Books" Fallacy

VICTOR S. YARROS

It is generally known that we have a school of thinkers and educators who believe that the best way to educate ourselves, in or out of the colleges and schools, is to study the Great Books of the ages, including our own. To the Great Books we owe all that we know, all the wisdom we possess, all the noblest aspirations we seek to realize as civilized men. Why, then, should we read inferior books or depend on textbooks, asks Mark Van Doren in his *Liberal Education*? The Great Books *are* our textbooks. And has not culture been defined by Matthew Arnold as "knowing the best that has been said and written through the ages"?

Few colleges have been persuaded to discard their textbooks and to make the one hundred Great Books the substance of their respective curricula. Many of the Great Books are not recommended to the students in most of our colleges, and are not read by the majority of our youth. Only St. John's College, in Maryland, has had the boldness and the rigorous logic required to treat one hundred and ten books as its textbooks, and to insist that the professors and instructors, as well as the students, read, ponder, and discuss these Great Books. The list, as last revised in the light of reflection and experience, is presented in full by Van Doren, and if we analyze it dispassionately, without prejudice, some very important lessons emerge, lessons educators and enlightened laymen cannot afford to ignore.

What is true of the St. John's list would be true, in the main, of any *other* list of "the greatest books." The notion that *any* list of the greatest books is adequate from the viewpoint of the liberal educator and should serve as the college curriculum in our time and the actual world situation can be shown to be thoroughly fallacious. It is easy to show, further, that a man may conscientiously read and ponder all the books on St. John's list and yet go out into the contemporary world wholly unfit to do his part as a citizen of a democracy, or near democracy, to think straight on the most vital and difficult problems of his day, to vote for the best candidates and the soundest party platforms, to defend his essential rights.

This may strike many as an amazing statement about the St. John's carefully prepared list of the Great Books, but it is absolutely true.

Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustine, Dante, Leibnitz, and most of the other classical authors on the list will not enable us to deal intelligently with

such questions as mass unemployment, finance capitalism, corporate monopoly, the divorce between ownership and management of industrial enterprises, effective regulation of public utilities, war and peace, the proper relationship between legislative bodies and executives, justice in taxation, and a score of other baffling issues which we face and must deal with in the light of our technology, our science and our ethical ideas.

A list of Great Books which fails to include a single book on the French Revolution, on the decline of *laissez faire,* on the rise and development of the Trade Union and Labor movements, on Socialism, on Russian Soviet-Communism, on the Wilson-Roosevelt economic and social reforms, on the growth of Unitarianism, Agnosticism, and Rationalism in the religious realm, on poverty in the midst of potential abundance, such a list is fantastically grotesque.

A list of Great Books in which we find nothing of Carlyle, of Ruskin, of the British Christian Socialist, of the Fabian Society, of the democratization of Britain and her colonial policy, of the virtual elimination of the House of Lords, of similar trends in the United States, exemplified by the Referendum and Initiative, the transformation of the Senate, the enfranchisement of women, the demand for further major changes in our Federal Constitution, is not a list which prepares our citizenry to interpret correctly the intellectual and social movements and phenomena of their era.

Let us look at the extraordinary list from another angle. What thinkers and writers have shaped, molded and directed the spiritual and philosophical trends of the last seventy or eighty eventful years? We naturally and spontaneously name, first, the following: Comte, Spencer, Huxley, Proudhon, Tolstoy, Kropotkin, Nietzsche, Wells, Shaw, Henry George, Dewey, Renan, Fraser, Freud. Not one of these men is on the list. Surely, their place in *our* world cannot be taken by Plato or St. Thomas.

Parenthetically, it may be observed that the list betrays a dubious and suspicious slant even in the selection of purely literary works. Dostoievski, for example, is represented by a single novel, *The Possessed,* which is *not* his best work. Flaubert is represented by *Bouvard and Pecushet,* a minor work, Ibsen by *Ghosts and Rosmersholm.* Not one of the "radical" social plays of Ibsen is listed. Not "The Pillars of Society," not "The Enemy of the People," not "The Doll's House." Jane Austin, Balzac, George Eliot, Hardy, Meredith, Hugo, Wells, Zola, Melville, Henry James are conspicuous by their absence.

So, oddly enough, is *history.* Herodotus and Thucydides are on the list, but not a single modern historian, German, French, British, or American, is honored by the slightest recognition. This contempt for modern history is not explicable on any rational ground. There is a limit to superstitious veneration for classicism and tradition. St. John's College seems to believe in intellectual isolationism and total indifference to the present.

In short, to repeat an earlier statement, St. John's prefers to graduate students who are ignorant of the pressing problems they will be called upon to help solve, bewildered by situations and conditions about and around them, and dependent for their real, vital education on commercial newspapers, magazines, radio forums and movies. A college which deliberately overlooked *all* the classical masterpieces and strictly followed a list of *books written since 1850,* say, would serve the present and the near future more successfully from the viewpoint of genuine human progress and the ideal of an abundant and noble life for the individual. The classicists and traditionalists are poor and blind guides in the field of education. So far as their policy is concerned, the race between catastrophe and the right type of education is decided in advance in favor of catastrophe. The St. John's list should serve as a horrible example of educational Bourbonism. The good intentions of St. John's conservatives would, in truth, produce a chaotic hell on this planet.

Many books *not* "great" intrinsically are more valuable in education for life, citizenship, and progress than most ancient masterworks. The Great Books curriculum is a naive and transparent fallacy.

Let us now consider the claims being advanced by Chancellor Robert Maynard Hutchins—a progressive and bold educator to whom we are indebted for several genuine reforms—for the rôle of the great books in the "classes" reported to be flourishing in seventeen cities under the guidance and inspiration of the recently organized Great Books Foundation. Mr. Hutchins has attempted to meet and refute certain severe criticisms of his favorite scheme. He denies that the Great Books are "antiquarian," or that the spirit of medievalism pervades the movement of which he is today the most influential spokesman. What, he exclaims, is the Bible antiquarian, or Shakespeare, or the Declaration of Independence? Is culture reactionary? Why, even Freud is read and discussed in the Great Books classes and courses!

But Mr. Hutchins fails to meet the objection that the classes he commends and encourages approach and treat their task in a spirit which may fairly be characterized as medieval and antiquarian. The Bible, as interpreted and used by the Fundamentalist of Tennessee, *is* antiquarain. The Bible read and enjoyed by a Matthew Arnold, or Stephen Leslie, or Lord Morley, is a radically different document. The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life. The Bible is not our authority today in a single science, natural or social. It is, here and there, great literature, fine and noble poetry, moving drama. Many *ir*religious persons discover it after forty or fifty, and then read it with keen pleasure. But it is unquestionably a valuable collection of books written by gifted and able men in the light of their time. It was an ignorant and superstitious time. We reject all of its miracles, myths, and legends. But there is wisdom in Ecclesiastes, and in some of the proverbs ascribed to Solomon. The dialectics and argumentation of Job are not as logical or as convincing as the pious pretend to believe. Still, the Bible *is* a great book, to be studied critically and soberly, without tears or credulity.

The quintessential consideration is simply this: knowledge and education are not acquired or utilized in a vacuum. We must ask: Education and knowledge for what? The rational answer is: For citizenship, for civilized living in a modern community, for an enlightened attitude toward industry, for the proper use of leisure, for appreciation of beauty in the arts and in human conduct.

Let the adult education classes do their work with the foregoing question and answer in mind, and no one will doubt their utility. The books they will read and discuss will enable them to comprehend, and help solve eventually, the pressing and vital problems of

our period—outlawing war, taking some cautious steps toward World Government, freeing trade from crippling restrictions, promoting industrial peace, effectively regulating monopoly, and substantially improving utility control, providing decent housing in our overcrowded cities, preventing mass unemployment, combating anti-Semitism and Negrophobia.

Let us suppose that a circular signed by eminent educators and scientists went forth to millions of our people, describing the classes and courses just mentioned and the beneficial effects that might be reasonably expected. Not seventeen, but seven hundred communities would respond enthusiastically, organize classes, and engage in lively, stimulating, and profitable discussion. Politics would enter a new phase. Issues would replace platitudes and tags. Candidates would be forced to take clear and honest positions on actual questions. Vulgar name-calling would be frowned down, and campaigns would cease to be ill-smelling mud baths.

The books selected for these courses would not all be "great." Some would be ancient—Plato's *Republic,* for instance, Machiavelli's *The Prince.* But the list would include works by Henry George, John Maynard Keynes, Alvin H. Hanson, Charles A. Beard, Norman Thomas, Ralph Bliss Perry, the Fabian Society, Leon Blum, John Dewey, Albert Einstein. In other words, useful, informing, up-to-date books on the social sciences would outnumber the "great" classics, which of course, are great and should be read by all enlightened persons.

What adult education needs is vitality and immediate appeal. We crave culture, but we have to work, live in society, vote, invest, save, attend to tasks that brook no delay, find rational recreation and entertainment.

To conclude and repeat: The Great Books Foundation rests on a fallacy.

Two recent developments in higher education may perhaps serve as significant commentaries on the foregoing observations. In California, an eighteen-month experiment by sixteen schools, undertaken by the State Department of Education, is said to have demonstrated the fact that the systematic use of current materials — editorials, magazine articles, reports by major groups or organizations, and the like—enables teachers and pupils to function much more effectively than do classes conducted under traditional practices. Subjects generally considered dull take on freshness, vitality, and interest. Pupil participation becomes lively and discussion spirited. This is true of courses in government, economics, language. Teachers feel they have to be alert, up-to-date, and well informed. Routine undergoes a process of dramatization. This "project," as it is called, is arousing attention and is likely to be adopted in other states, at least experimentally. What is there surprising in all this? Intelligent journalists and editors would have predicted the results in question.

The new president of Dartmouth, Mr. John Dickey, is raising a fund of four million dollars for the purpose of constructing and operating a modern auditorium, with appropriate annexes and facilities, designed to terminate the isolation of the colleges from the dynamic life of the society it is supposed to educate and fit for the tasks of life. In addition to the regular courses and classes, the college will invite representative outsiders, lay and other, to talk to the students on the issues of the day—political, social, ethical, industrial. Bankers, corporate executives, labor leaders, writers, statesmen, clergymen, educators will appear in the annual series of lectures and debates, and members of the Dartmouth faculty will be given opportunities to take part in the series in a new rôle—as individuals sans privileges, on a footing of equality with the outsiders. President Dickey expects much benefit, intellectual and moral, from this new feature. And he is amply warranted in this expectation. The tides and currents of life cannot in our time be arrested at the gates of the college or university. They must be allowed to enter and reach the student body as well as the faculty. Plato will be studied, but so will Norman Thomas, Henry Wallace, John L. Lewis, Walter Reuther, Walter Lippmann, Professor Niebuhr and Professor Northrop. More light, more air, more movement, more realism will revivify our academies and invigorate our youth. Apathy, cynicism, and nihilism will vanish.

We Strengthen Each Other

SHELDON SHEPHARD

That good will is a high aim of man and will be a fruitful source of well-being we all agree. This truth has been recognized throughout the history of man's thought about problems of human relationships. No ancient voice but speaks with that utterance, no modern discovery but shouts, "Amen."

That which has always been a desirable human characteristic and a needed element of human contacts has come in our day to be a necessity for survival. At every point on the spinning globe there are sparks of hate which may be fanned into fires of blazing destruction. Everywhere that there is ill will there is the threat of the next terrible war.

A pressing and basic problem of the human being now is the development of good will. So drastic is our need that we can spare no ally in the cause. We cannot afford to let spill one drop of the precious ointment which can ease the increasing irritations of human relations.

We must find a large part of our resource of good will in religion, for religion deals with good will. Religion is ensconced so deeply in the hearts of men that whatever is the characteristic of a religion will be stamped on the nature of the society of which it is a part. Unfortunately religion has been a prolific producer of ill will. Competition, unfair judgment, condemnation have sometimes seemed to make ill will a prominent part in religion. Wise observers have often wondered if good will might have to be grown in the world, not in the gardens of religion but outside its walls.

Should we be doomed to that decision, we should have to push our desired goal of peace on earth a long way further off. Men are likely to be little better than their gods. Their society cannot be much holier than their temples. Their characters will shine with no brighter glory than that radiating from the suns of their religions. If we cannot find in the aspirations of men's

worship the seeds of our new society, we can have little hope of their discovery.

But if we learn that everywhere, from all temples, there ring out chants of good will, perhaps we can all be strengthened in hope and purpose. If there is a World Faith, which includes a confidence in good will and an effort to establish its source in human hearts, perhaps we can renew our courage and go forth again confident in the practicality of our goal.

Should we believe that in our own religious expressions there is a cultivation of good will, but that nowhere else is the desirable crop being produced, we might indeed be discouraged. We are all members of such tiny minorities. Must we wait until our particular voice speaks good will in every corner of the earth?

The Christian lays the foundations of peace on the stone of good will and good deeds: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." He does not then stand in hopelessness, seeing no others bearing stones to add to his. Still less will he fend others off and forbid their establishing further the strength of the foundation. He will rejoice to see them come in procession through channels dear to the hearts of people in every corner of the earth. He sees that stone from the Talmud put into solid place in history by the Jew: "What is hurtful to yourself do not to your fellow man." For surely the cessation of that which is hurtful to your fellow man is a solid stone in the foundations of peace. With that attainment the hosts of destruction depart.

From many voices come exhortations falling on ears to whom our words are foreign, building up for us a world atmosphere in which enmity and war can be smothered. "Hurt not others with that which pains yourself," hears the Buddhist. And the precepts of Confuscianism exhort the people: "Do not unto others what you would not that they should do unto you." And the call is echoed by a religion which in many places exists side by side with Buddhism. Hinduism advises as the total of duties required in human relationships: "Do naught to others which if done to thee would cause thee pain."

If these are thought to be negative or passive expressions of the doctrine of good will, or the practice known to Christians as The Golden Rule, we need but turn to other sources to find positive declarations, some of them including even stronger terms, and some of them taking in more territory, than the familiar Christian quotation. For it is the Mohammedan whose religion tells him: "No one of you is a believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself." Here is a statement probing deeper into the heart than the injunction to do unto others that which we should like to have them do to us. The Mohammedan is informed that he must not only perform such deeds. He must love for his brother that which he loves for himself. This is akin to the injunction of Paul that "every one should look not upon the things of himself, but upon the things of others." This is an X-ray of the heart. To the kind act it adds high motive. To the doing it adds the desire that all may have that which one wishes for himself. This precept of Islam is like the second great commandment: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

An expression of Sikhism is similar, perhaps including even a true delineation of brotherhood and equality. "As thou deemest thyself so deem others" would seem to involve the identification of oneself with all persons. There is here something of the revelation that whatever one does to another he does to himself. This brotherhood of identification is perhaps more definitely portrayed in an instruction of Taoism: "Regard your neighbor's gain as your own; and regard your neighbor's loss as your own." What support we have here in our efforts to establish an atmosphere of peace and cooperation! If your neighbor's loss is regarded as your own how can you tear him down? How bomb his lands, destroy his homes, kill his sons?

We should remember that there are voices of good will which extend the reach of their brotherhood even further than to the limits of human habitations. Some of them would develop a spirit of understanding and appreciation which would identify our interests with that of all creatures. Some of that teaching appears in Hinduism and Buddhism. And Jainism says: "In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as our own self."

Whatever one's particular religion or denomination, and however right for him he may consider its tenets, behold what an array of allies we have in the struggle for good will and peace. These are not our enemies, not our competitors; these are our cooperators.

To set up among these various religions those feelings of strife, condemnation and proselyting which neutralize the influences for good will, is senseless waste of spiritual resource. It is invitation to disaster.

To rejoice at every whisper of brotherhood and good will gives one renewed inspiration and strength. To unite efforts with all those everywhere who teach the way of friendship and love is to give substance to dreams. Every religion which teaches good will is doing our work. We strengthen each other.

Our Decadent Christian Sex Morality

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

I call our prevailing so-called Christian sex morality decadent because it represents a caricature of sex and a travesty of morality. The recent discussion revolving around the desirability of changing our divorce laws and improving our marriage laws has again brought the whole issue of sex morality into sharp focus and has revealed to what extent our thinking about sex has remained in the jungle of fear and the swamp of superstition, and has become involved with dishonesty and hypocrisy. And it could hardly be otherwise, for the whole subject of sex morality in religious, and especially in Christian, circles has been approached all these centuries not with the authority of scientists and philosophers but with the pseudo-authority of theologians and dogmatists whose premises concerning the determinants of our sex mores have been glibly posited not upon scientific facts and reasonable thinking, but upon certain gratuitous assumptions that derive from Biblical and other myths whose validity for our day and age is, to say the least, highly questionable.

With few exceptions, the prevailing Christian sex morality of our day goes back to that dogma of the

Dark Ages which states that because of Adam's fall all human beings are from birth contaminated by the original sin of their first forebear and that therefore the very process of procreation, dealing with one of the most natural and powerful of human emotional drives, is in and of itself something carnal, i.e., vile and sinful. From this doctrine it is, of course, easy to argue for those inhibitions and restrictions with which the church throughout the ages has encumbered the sex relationship, has frightened its members with the bogey of carnal lust, etc., and made itself the arbiter concerning individual, family, and social morality. It is hardly saying too much to maintain that a society like ours, living in a social climate so different from that of the ancients, whose moral taboos and sex teachings were adapted to a much simpler form of life, can hardly be satisfied to have certain stereotyped and traditionally hallowed abracadabras invoked for the control of its sex practices, its marriage and divorce laws.

Yet we are being told by so-called religious and moral authorities that we must continue to be guided in this twentieth century in our sex mores by certain ancient rules and traditional regulations that may have been more or less adequate for their own day but will hardly impress us today with their spurious claims to absolute and final judgment upon the relationship between male and female. It may be said that even in the realm of sex morality there exists a "horse and buggy age" to which no honest and intelligent people will want to return. The church still teaches, with many variations of the original theme, that "I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," (Psalm 51:5). We are still being told and with apparently straight faces and great solemnity that the sex instinct is fundamentally something dirty, something wicked, something which in the interest of holiness had better be suppressed entirely. Does not the Apostle Paul, hardly qualified to speak as an expert in such matters, endorse the single over the married state and in that connection make the delightful concession that "it is better to marry than to burn," thereby making of the marriage relationship, which the church lauds as instituted of God and sanctified by Jesus, something, which if good at all, can at best be classed as something second-rate in the lives of people? Of course, it is often forgotten in this connection that the great Apostle also calls the human body "a temple of the Holy Spirit," (I Cor. 6:19), and he does so without either qualifying its erotic instincts or making them sinful and alien inhabitants of this "temple."

How early Christianity looked upon sex is well illustrated by the example of that illustrious church father, the great Origen, who as a youth emasculated himself *ad majorem Dei gloriam*—"for the greater glory of God;" but I am certain that not even the church which rates his genius as scholar and teacher so highly would endorse his method for escaping the snares of the flesh and the wiles of women. Even celibates among the clergy and the religious are not likely publicly to recommend a mutilation of God's gift of the human body as a measure with which to meet the temptations of carnality. If all this were not so pathetically tragic, we might laugh it off; but unfortunately we are dealing here with an ancient and tradition-hallowed set of taboos and superstitions that to this day bedevil the minds of people and are responsible not only for that clandestine practice of sexual immorality which we know is prevalent in all circles of our society but also for much of the mental disorder, illness, and spiritual confusion that characterize our age, not to mention the broken homes.

The church teaches to all intents and purposes that the sole reason for marriage must be the desire to produce children, and that to marry solely for the sake of companionship, a companionship which will find a normal and beautiful expression in a union of bodies, is a crime against the laws of nature and nature's God. What unspeakable sacrilege! I believe that as the science of psychiatry develops, it will become increasingly apparent to what extent the attitude of the church toward marrige and extra-marital sex relations has confused rather than clarified the whole sex issue and how badly religious people especially need to be informed regarding this matter if they are to escape that mental upset and inner insecurity which haunt so many of our married and unmarried folk. As far as I am concerned, the Kinsey report so far published contains more common sense on the question of sex behaviour than can be found in all the so-called sacred scriptures still extant.

Our decadent Christian sex morality has made of marriage—the most natural and beautiful of human relations—something to be feared and suspected, yes, even to be shunned. The church has surrounded this institution with rules and regulations which are ostensibly intended to guard the sanctity of personality and the security of the home, but usually do precisely the opposite, judging from the many marriages, allegedly "made in heaven" under the supervision of priest or pastor, that end in the divorce courts or founder upon the rock of personal maladjustment and tragedy.

The church theory of marriage and divorce is posited upon a myth, a myth wherein a mythical woman, Eve, gives a mythical apple to a mythical man, Adam, whereupon suddenly the relationship between these two human beings becomes sinful, and especially the union of their bodies in love grows into something hideous and despicable. Who says so? A few bearded ancients whose mental peregrinations into the realms of individual and social psychology and moral philosophy hardly deserve our respect, and certainly challenge our critical examination. Specifically Christian doctrine upon marriage and divorce adds to the dicta of the very ancient those of a few less ancient but equally unreliable voices whose authority in the realm of sex morality we have every reason to question. We in the churches are supposed to take as final authority upon such matters the judgments of Jesus and Paul, both of them unacquainted with love of women, both of them celibates, and both of them speaking in the spirit of an eschatology that envisaged an early end of all things, the precipitous coming of the Kingdom of God, when, quite reasonably, it might be assumed that such matters as marriage and sexual relations would no more be of any particular human interest. Does not Jesus himself say that "in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven"? (Matthew 22:30.)

Christian teaching regarding marriage and divorce, and especially as concerns the general problem of sex morality, remains to this day obscure and confused because it is rooted in the doctrine of original sin and in the fantastic vagaries of Paul; it is therefore not surprising that it should remain unrealistic and hypocritical. Celibacy, the claim that only the church can consecrate marriage and speak with authority upon divorce, all these and more are just some of the "strange

fruit" grown from the soil of theological fantasy and moral ineptitude. I am sure that in an increasing measure mature and intelligent men and women will demand stronger and more persuasive authority to address them upon so important a theme as sex morality than a young Jewish teacher of two thousand years ago or that enthusiastic Apostle of his who, although he had never seen or heard Jesus, presumed to become his chief interpreter and his most inspired mouthpiece even in the realm of personal and social morality. To this day we listen with fascination to the lovely words of the marriage service which say, "whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," but we also cannot help, as we hear these familiar words, asking ourselves "but *whom does God join together,* and what right have we to assume that pastor or priest know?"

Today our society is in an almost hopeless muddle as regards marriage, divorce, and sex morality in general; not because of the natural perversity of men and women, but because the moral atmosphere surrounding our sex relations has been contaminated and poisoned with phobias and superstitions that arbitrary and wilful ecclesiastics seek to perpetuate in order to maintain their hold upon the consciences and lives of credulous and intimidated people. Our present hysteria over a possible reform of our marriage and divorce laws is a case in instance, and the obvious confusion will not end as long as we allow clerics, celibates or "Elmer Gantrys," to tell us what to do. I see only one way, and it is a long and hard one, that may eventually lead us to sanity and health in this whole matter of sex morality: let there be created in every civilized land a commission of scientists and scholars, of educators, physicians, psychiatrists, and philosophers, and let them take this tremendous problem under advisement and careful study. It will take much time and much earnest effort, besides great courage and perseverance; but the outcome can only be an improvement over our present hypocrisy and confusion and may lead to some changes that are bound to save us from the corroding influence of a pseudo-morality that parades under the guise of divine authority and seeks to destroy wholesome natural instincts and institutions with the threat of hellfire and eternal damnation.

We need today a new and radically different approach to the whole problem of sex morality; we need fearless and honest men and women to spearhead this new approach, and we need badly among our badgered and bullied people a reawakening to a sense of their own dignity and responsibility in this matter and to the simple realization that sex has long ceased to be a subject relegated to the closets of hush-hush or hidden in the garrets of secrecy and alarm. Let the topic of sex morality be freely ventilated, openly discussed, and bravely attacked. That way leads to social health and mental sanity. As long as we make of sex a monstrosity and of morality a mockery, our society will continue on its headlong path towards disaster.

Aristotle

LEONARD B. GRAY

When one studies the intellectual history of mankind, one is strikingly impressed by these four significant facts: great flowering of the human intellect occurs but seldom; each flowering is confined to a comparatively small section of the globe; each flowering is generally best incarnated and represented by some one city or town; and any great intellect comes fully into his own only in those periods when the contemporary intellectual tastes and capacities are capable of it. We know that there were at least four great flowerings of the human intellect, not counting the great intellects here and there and now and then outside of these flowerings. These four remarkable manifestations of the intellect of man were Greek philosophy and literature in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., German philosophy and literature during the first half of the nineteenth century, Russian fiction in the second half of the nineteenth century, and American literature in the middle part of the nineteenth century. With the exception of the Russian, each of these flowerings had its great center: that of the Greek, Athens; that of the German, Weimar; and that of the American, Concord, Massachusetts. To be sure, Hegel, Kant, Whitman, Hawthorne, Melville, and others who were expressions and parts of these flowerings did not live in these centers, except Hawthorne for a short time in Concord, and yet these three places were obviously the centers of these three unusually fruitful periods of human thought.

Aristotle appeared in and to a large degree accounted for the great period of Greek intellect, and he appeared in Athens at a time when he could be best appreciated there. Then the intellectual glory that was Greece passed with his passing, and the decadent age that followed him almost lost sight of him, and was the means of nearly losing him from the history of human thought. During the great Roman age Aristotle remained somewhat in eclipse, partly because Cicero, naturally the best prepared in that day to be a sounding board of praise for Aristotle, was not quite intellectually up to the philosopher's major works, and confined himself to the dialogues, the lesser productions of the Greek thinker. The latter part of the thirteenth century produced a favorable intellectual climate that appreciated Aristotle, perhaps a bit extravagantly, and brought him to the height of his glory. Indeed, it was in the year 1300 A.D. that the highest honor came to him, when Dante in his *Divine Comedia* called him "the master of those who know." For over two thousand years this great Grecian philosopher dominated philosophical and theological thinking. Then, reaction against him set in and gradually grew, until the eighteenth century, a period of mechanical philosophy and shallow learning, brought about the greatest neglect of him since the Christian era. And then in the first half of the nineteenth century there came in Germany her greatest intellectual period and the second great period of philosophy in the world's history. Hegel, Kant, and Goethe studied Aristotle earnestly, advocated his writings, and lifted him again into recognition and honor. Indeed, I think that it can be rightfully claimed that the great Germans in this period gave this great Greek philosopher the truest estimate in all history, an estimate that avoided the neglect and the extravagant praise, and the condemnation that at various periods

Aristotle had received. Hegel, who considered Aristotle the most worthy of study of all the ancients, and also Kant, found more affinity with the great thinkers of the Grecian period, especially with the subject of this essay, than with the philosophers of any other period. Goethe, both scientist and philosopher like his Greek ideal, and possessing a universal mind as the Greek did, said that if he had his life to live over again he would devote it to the study of Nature and Aristotle, and in enthusiastic wonder and praise exclaimed: "It is beyond all conception what that man espied, saw, beheld, remarked, observed."

The city of Stagira in the mountains of Macedonia was the birthplace of Aristotle and 384 B.C. was the year of his birth. The boy's father, Nicomachus, was a physician of ability and success in the city, the author of several medical works, a friend of Amyntas, the Macedonian king, and his physician when the king came to the mountains for several months each year, chiefly for the exciting and dangerous sport of hunting wild hogs. When Nicomachus accompanied the royal party on hunting trips, little Aristo, as he was called, refused to be left behind. What adventurous and halcyon days those were for the eager lad when he trotted by his father's side, carrying the formidable bow which he had made himself, locating for the king the gulches where the boars fed, and the bee-trees by watching the flights of bees! The king was fond of his skilled doctor and the doctor's bright boy, and one year on returning to Stagira he surprised and delighted little Aristo by giving the lad the finest bow that ever was, a bow all tipped with silver and feathers.

One summer when the boy was quite young, tragedy in those wild mountains came in the form of a huge avalanche of sliding stones that struck and crushed Nicomachus to death. Proscenus, a near kinsman, took over the care of the youth. The next summer there was another surprise for the boy. The king brought Philip, his own son, about the age of the mountain boy. As they climbed the mountains and hunted, the two boys formed a fast and wonderful friendship. A stranger, seeing Aristo, complimented the king on his remarkable son. Amyntas replied: "The other boy is mine—but I wish they both were." Indeed, he would take his favorite back to the capital and make him a member of his court. But the studious had always been the dominant element in this athletic mountain boy. Not the court, but the great school of the great Plato in Athens was the object of his ambitions. And so the next year Aristotle, aged seventeen, tall, straight, bronzed, and strong, with an unusually alert face, attracting all who saw him, rolled his belongings in bearskin, tied with thongs, and started for the intellectual center of Greece.

At once Plato was impressed by the youth from the mountains. At once he recognized that an intellectual giant such as seldom appears had come into the world of thinking men. The great teacher was then a little over sixty—about the same age that Socrates had been when he himself, as a bright youth, became a pupil of the first great Greek philosopher—and as delighted with his new find as Socrates had been with his. To both masters there was given the supreme joy—the joy of a great teacher finding a great pupil. But at sixty Socrates had been older in appearance and in spirit than the sixty-year-old Plato now seemed to be. The master that greeted the boy from Stagira had been kept exceptionally well-preserved and young-spirited by his wealthy, aristocratic, easy life. To an advanced age he was to wear his purple robe with a dignified, proud manner and with the eager look of a youth. But enduring severe Thracian winters in bare feet and picking up cold snacks of food here and there had prematurely taken the youth out of Socrates.

Plato gave his best to his great discovery. How moving to think of those wonderful twenty years the master kept the young man with him, at least of those happy years before shadows fell on that famous school! In that ideal place, that garden school, what halcyon hours the two knew together, often in the lecture room, more often perhaps in conversation on marble benches on cool evenings under the trees while the quiet stars looked down upon them. The mountain boy had not been there more than three years when his teacher called him the chief ornament of the school and his fellow students called him "The Mind." Already the youth was acquainted with the sages of the past and with the leading thinkers of his day. Early whispers that the pupil would excel the teacher, and evidences that he did in some respects, did not make the large-souled Plato jealous. The large mind of the master took pride in watching the mind of the youth reaching out to interests and realms of study that he himself had not explored to any great extent, to the delving into natural history, to the collecting of plants and rocks and animals, and to the consideration of practical working of economic schemes.

And yet towards the close of his life the grand old sage was hurt, perhaps severely, by his favorite pupil. We know that the old man spoke of the young man as a foal that kicks his mother after draining her dry. The naturally independent mind of young Aristotle increasingly became independent in his studies as he said: "Dear is Plato, but dearer still is truth." And so there began "the little rift within the lute" that gradually developed into a big rift. First inwardly, and then openly, more and more strongly, the young independent repudiated the Platonic teaching of poetry, rhetoric, elocution, polite accomplishments, and especially Plato's famous doctrine of ideas. Schism broke out in the beautiful, peaceful garden school as vigorous mind clashed with vigorous mind. We have it from Proclus that Aristotle "proclaimed loudly in his dialogues that he was unable to sympathize with the doctrine of ideas."

We have to understand that, aside from their eager and universal search for truth that they had in common, these two great minds were essentially different. Plato's mind was poetical, mystical, intuitive. It believed in and sought a truth of which glimpses only could be obtained, partly by the most abstract powers of thought, partly by imagination. It aimed not at demonstrations which could be stated concretely and once for all, but rather preferred analogies and hints of truth. To this greatest and most original of metaphysical philosophers, eternity, the life of the gods, the supra-sensible world of ideas were more real and important than the world of affairs. His pupil, on the other hand, possessed a scientific matter-of-fact mind that was not guided by poetic impulse and imagination in its search for truth. His passion was for definite knowledge so methodized that it could be stated in a general principle or law. Not for his type of mind were half-lights nor much interest in the nature of God, in the operation of Providence, and in the immortality of the soul. Only naked truth for him. While we see the poet in the

artistry, grace, beauty, and ornamentation of Plato's style, we see the scientist in Aristotle's compact, terse, sparse style that close-fitted his thought. Plato's passion was truth above the scientific; Aristotle's passion was definite and methodized experience.

From these two great and independent thinkers posterity has named and kept these two distinct types of mind, the Platonist and the Aristotelian—the realists who make reason independent of the senses and assert that the universal is more real than the particular, and the nominalists who assert the superior reality of individual objects. The latter with their originator "proclaim loudly" against Plato's doctrine of ideas which disparaged the world of sensible objects. When we form a conception, or think we do, of any particular object by means of our senses, this doctrine claims, we are really like men sitting in a dimly-lighted cavern and staring at shadows on the wall. The world of the senses is a world of shadows, but the world of ideas is the true world. In the world of sense what we call good or beautiful things are merely those which have a faint resemblance to the idea of the good or the beautiful. Not only are ideas the causes of qualities and attributes in things but they are also heads of classes or universals, and these ideas alone have complete reality. But the matter-of-fact, tough mind of Aristotle in the nominalist has always attacked this Platonic realism because it believes that such realism is the root of endless mysticism and scholarly nonsense.

The opposition of his favorite pupil was the only thing that marred the otherwise complete peace and happiness of Plato's old age. The grand and lovable old philosopher was honored and loved by nearly everybody, and at his death in the year 347 B.C. his school remained loyal to him. This meant that Aristotle paid for his independent thinking. There was no place for him in the Academy or even anywhere in Athens.

Adventurous indeed were Aristotle's years away from the intellectual center of Greece, sometimes in dramatic action, always in thought, as our scientist-philosopher traveled, observed, taught, and enjoyed ample leisure for experimentation and contemplation. He married the fair princess, Pythian, daughter of the enlightened Hermeas who welcomed him to Atarneas when he left Athens. He taught Alexander, son of Philip of Macedon, his boyhood playmate and friend; experienced carefree leisure and happiness at court for a few years; and left such an impression upon the young prince that he was moved to say: "What Aristotle is in the world of thought, I will be in the world of action."

After Philip's assassination in 336 B.C. and the boy-king had turned his mind to imperial business and plans for great conquests, there was no longer need for Aristotle to remain at court. So with the prestige of Alexander's favor and money, he returned at the age of fifty to the city of his happy student years to fulfill a long-cherished dream—the founding of a school of his own. He was now widely-traveled and experienced, seasoned with ripened wisdom, the passions of his youth somewhat tempered, strong and healthy, his intellectual powers matured and at their best. His early independent views were about the same, but stronger, deeper entrenched, and more developed. Naturally there was no place for him in Plato's old school which he found in the same groves of Academe and still flourishing under the able leadership of Xenocrates. They would not welcome him there had he wished it, and he did not. Almost immediately in the grounds attached to the Temple of the Lycean Apollo on the eastern side of the city he set up his own school soon to become the famous Lyceum. At last his great hour had come.

And so, Aristotle started what were to be twelve years of study and research work, teaching and writing, which for their intensity and quality were seldom, if ever, equalled in all history. Both the substance and method of his teaching were to be different from Plato's. His manner was more energetic and enthusiastic than that of his former teacher. Unlike his aristocratic master who carefully selected his pupils, the head of the Lyceum welcomed students of all types, including many foreigners, it is said. We know that many young eager minds flocked to him. Soon from lecturing and free intercoursing under the covered walks, he and the Aristotelian scholars were to acquire the name, "Peripatetics." Clear in Aristotle's mind was exactly what he wanted to do. He would reconstruct each branch of science and frame his own philosophy. He would trace out the laws on which human reason proceeds, become the first to reduce these laws to a science and produce a logic. Out of his efforts was to come his famous syllogism, an argument stated in logical form, consisting of three propositions, the first two being called the premises, and the last the conclusion, which is the matter to be proved. He would organize and direct his pupils in the exploration and the compilation of vast stores of knowledge. Some say that at one time, financed by eight hundred talents ($4,000,000 in our purchasing power), his own large fortune supplemented by what Alexander supplied for physical and biological equipment and research, Aristotle had a thousand men scattered throughout Greece and Asia, collecting specimens of the fauna and flora for him. Such immense enterprises and his "Method of Induction," which he was the first man to comprehend and expound and apply, make him the father of all true science and the one, above all ancient men, before whom present-day scientists bow with respect. He contributed, many claim, more than any other one man in all history, to the scientific education of the world. Although some of his claims, such as attributing headaches to the wind on the brain, asserting that people with large heads have small ability to recollect, ascribing to powdered grasshopper wings the power to cure gout, and the assertion that man has only eight ribs on each side, have been proved wrong and absurd, many of his observations and experimentations were surprisingly accurate in scientific matters. He anticipated Harvey by two thousand years in calling the heart a pump that forces the blood to the extremities of the body. He discovered more about the horse than any man before the time of Leonardo da Vinci and his discoveries about this animal were used by the great da Vinci as the basis of still greater discoveries. Professor Sundevall, the great zoölogist of Stockholm, reckoned that the Stagirite showed himself acquainted with five hundred species, seventy mammals, one hundred and fifty birds, twenty reptiles, one hundred and sixteen fishes, sixty species of insects and Arachnids, twenty Crustaceans, and forty molluscs and annelids. Simply ravished with astonishment are scientific authorities about the multitude of facts collected by this Greek scientist whom, many claim, was the first man to use

his eyes. In science, however, it was not the amount of knowledge, great as it was, that was Aristotle's most distinctive contribution to posterity. Rather his most valuable scientific contribution was his method of analytic insight which consists in the concentration of the mind upon the subject in hand, marshalling together all the facts and opinions upon it, and dwelling on these and scrutinizing and comparing them until a light flashes on the whole subject. In this great and enduring contribution, the father of science became history's strongest opponent of ignorance and most ardent promoter of truth, enlightenment, and maturity of mind.

And then, partly to rest his mind, but chiefly because his mind was insatiable, versatile, and universal, Aristotle would abruptly interrupt his scientific studies and give his whole attention to literary criticism, politics, philosophy, or one of the many other subjects that attracted him. Indeed, our philosopher reflected and wrote upon almost every conceivable subject during those intense and happy years at the Lyceum. One wonders that one mind could produce so many volumes and regrets that so many of Aristotle's works were only partially completed when his studies were quite suddenly and sadly interrupted by the death of Alexander, his protector, in 323 B.C. and by the overthrow of the Macedonian Party that soon followed the passing of the great conqueror. How pathetic to think of the Stagirite remembering the fate of Socrates, and saying that he would not give Athens a chance to sin a second time against philosophy, as he left his beloved school and unfinished manuscripts and fled to Chalcis where he died a few months later! But he left many contributions of high worth that are vital parts of our contemporary thinking, and since this article cannot be much more than suggestive, we will mention only a few more of these permanent contributions.

In his little book, *Poetics,* Aristotle's superb powers of analysis, which took him straight to the essentials and which have never been surpassed in all history, were at their best. The fifty pages of this book are pregnant with ideas that have dominated Western critical thought for many generations and remain today fundamental in literary criticism. Few books are so valuable as this to the present-day reader. In answering the basic question of the book, "What makes literature meaningful to us?", the author claims that the function of poetry is imitation, that the object of imitation is to portray the universal, and that the test of poetry is whether or not it gives us pleasure. While one function of art is surely to enrich us with more abundant emotions, it is also clear, as Aristotle claimed, that another function is catharsis, purification, releasing of emotions accumulated in us under the pressure of conventions and social restraints.

We like and accept our philosopher's insight in his claim that pleasure, contrary to the assertion of some philosophers, is not "the sense of what promotes life," but rather "the sense of life itself, the sense of the vital powers, the sense that any faculty whatsoever has met its proper object."

Aristotle's famous "mean," we believe, eternally remains the best guide to sensible and well-balanced living. Deficiency and excess are equally fatal. Extremes in gymnastic exercises or in eating or drinking are injurious to strength and health, whereas a suitable amount produces, sustains, and augments one's physical well-being. Even so, the means of temperance and of courage and of all other virtues promote one's entire well-being. The mean is not necessarily the mid-point between two extreme qualities. Rather it is the mid-point relative to the moral agent. What is too much or too little for one man may not be so for another. Six pounds of meat, the numerical mean between ten and two pounds, would likely be below the real mean for Milo, the famous Crotoniate wrestler, and above the real mean for some other men. Between foolhardiness and cowardice, courage is the mean; between boorishness and buffoonery, wit is the mean; between vanity and little-mindedness, high-mindedness is the mean; and between flattery and quarrelsomeness, friendliness is the mean. And so Aristotle goes on to show that virtue is a state of deliberate moral purpose consisting in a mean, determined by reason, that is relative to ourselves.

As regards the relation of the mind to external things, this Greek philosopher said that passive reason becomes all things by receiving their impress, while the constructive reason creates all things just as light brings colors into actual existence, while without light they would have remained mere possibilities. The mind contributes to the existence of things only what light does to color. The external world is a product of two sets of factors, namely, the rich and varied constituents of the universe and reason manifested in perceiving minds. Without the presence and cooperation of this perceiving reason, everything would be at once condemned to virtual annihilation. Aristotle said: "The possible existence of a thing is identical with the possibility in us of perceiving or knowing it," and again, "nothing exists except plus me."

And reason with our philosopher was a road to God, not chiefly as an instrument to be used to prove His existence, although it was surely this, but rather as a divine endowment and hence an evidence of God. Aristotle gloried in reason as something unique and divine. While everything else, he believed, could be traced to a natural origin, he did not believe that this faculty in man could be. Nature is instinct with God, and God, this great thinker claimed, is the Supreme Being, unmoved Himself, but the cause of motion in all things. The divine is an imminent idea operating in nature and in human thought and reason, but it is also more than imminent. There is the transcendent mind of God, over and above the divine in nature and in man, determining Himself through Himself, and bearing the same relation to the divine that the sun

(*Continued on page 77*)

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page 62*)

tional travelers only, two are available for the landowners with fields on both sides, and two for Austrians working in Hungary or vice versa.

As a result of the present barriers, people have to go long distances to reach permissible crossing places. What is worse, the Hungarians have decreed that only landowners themselves, but never their farm laborers, may cross the border to work the fields. In actual practice, this regulation serves to avoid open seizure of properties across the frontier, forcing landowners to sell their holdings at an abnormally low price.

—*Worldover Press.*

(*Continued from page 76*)

bears to light. And man may enter into the consciousness of God and become a partaker of His life. The soul or life is not a chance guest but rather a function. As sight is to the eye so the soul is to the body. It is, in fact, the perfect action of all the conditions of the bodily organization.

To man, Aristotle attached great importance. Man has a divine nature, especially in his reasoning faculty, as we have just said. He is so important, so much the center of things, that the state must not be considered as an end in itself, but rather as the prime necessity for the well-doing and well-being of man. This philosopher gave his highest praise to the great-souled man with his virtues of courage, temperance, liberality, magnificence, and magnanimity. Friendship and all the other virtues are of such high worth in and of themselves that they are ends in themselves, not merely means for something else. But Aristotle attached great worth and importance to men only within the circle of his elite. He had the typical Grecian disdain of the rulers towards the ruled. He saw little or no worth in the slaves and in the barbarians. He was a strict adherent to his contemporary Greek conception of man that did not rise to our Christian conception which attaches divine worth and dignity to every man.

Aristotle's greatest contribution to history and to us today was not his huge accumulation and arrangement of facts, great as this was; nor his interpretation of the universe and man's relation to the universe and of the meaning of human existence, profound as this was. Rather this great Greek scientist and philosopher is most meaningful to posterity for his love of facts, his splendid example of the inquiring mind, his clear analytic separation of the different sciences, and his earnest attempt to answer the major questions of life which encourages in us the belief that to raise the questions themselves clearly is a great matter and that there is truth in the saying: "It is a half-way to knowledge when you know what you have to inquire."

We are indebted to Aristotle chiefly not for what he saw, even though what he saw is beyond our conception, as it was beyond Goethe's conception, but rather for what this great ancient thinker encouraged us to seek.

The Study Table

America's Debt to Paul Blanshard

AMERICAN FREEDOM AND CATHOLIC POWER. *By Paul Blanshard. Boston: The Beacon Press. 350 pp. $3.50.*

This book, at the cost of exactly one cent per page, is the best current bargain of non-fiction reading for all those who have come to realize even partially—or to grant reluctantly—that the problems forced upon the American people by the Roman Catholic hierarchy are problems we dare not any longer postpone or evade. In a larger and more significant sense this book is *must* reading for every intelligent American, whether Catholic, Protestant, Gentile, or Jew. Indeed, the wide sale of the book (ninth, at this writing, in the best-seller listing of non-fiction books as estimated by the *New York Times*) despite the silent treatment which important newspapers and magazines have accorded it, is startling indication of the public's demand for this kind of frank and factual discussion.

One can only indicate briefly the general range of the problems here presented in thirteen unforgettable chapters. They include: Education and the Catholic Mind; The Church and Medicine; Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics; Marriage, Divorce and Annulment; Censorship and Boycott; Science, Scholarship and Superstition; The Catholic Plan for America, and six others. There have been other good books on Catholicism; but having read some half dozen of these, and many scattered articles, this reviewer still found in the Blanshard book information that surprised and shocked him.

The Catholic hierarchy is here revealed as an economic power of tremendous proportions, with one of the most effective lobbies seeking constantly—at the hands of federal and state government—a great variety of concessions and special privileges as means of increasing its influence over our American culture. Blanshard, deeply disturbed over the church's program of parochial education, calls this the crux of the Catholic problem. Such victories as we may win in legislative enactments and supreme court decisions, moreover, are rendered uncertain partly by the fact that other Christian groups are likewise interested in parochial education, and are not likely to be of much assistance in resisting Catholic encroachments. Already the Lutherans have given notice that if further concessions are granted to Catholicism they will cite these as precedents for their own demands for similar privileges. The logical consummation of such a process must be the end of public school education as we have known it.

The church's censorship of motion pictures, its restraining influence on press and radio are a scandal, regarding which—lacking the solid facts—we have been too polite or too fearful to speak out. The church's attitude in matters of sex, birth control, and eugenics, might be considered amusing if it did not have such serious social and cultural implications.

Precisely as in the matter of parochial education and, for that matter, in all its other activities, the church is motivated by extremely practical concerns. Without parochial schools—manned and censored by nuns who receive no salary—the church's main source of membership, and its vehicle of indoctrination would be seriously curtailed. This consideration applies also, of course, to the hierarchy's organized opposition to birth control. That overt opposition, dating back some thirty years, has increased in severity now that the hierarchy can no longer depend on immigrants from Europe to supply its numerical strength. The duties of Catholic and non-Catholic doctors in Catholic hospitals, in saving the lives of infants even to the point of sacrificing the mothers—and baptizing non-Catholic infants who are destined not to survive—startling though it may sound, is all part of the accepted pattern of doctrinal belief and institutional practice.

One is driven to the conclusion that the church, by the grim necessity of its own survival, is its own worst enemy. Blanshard does not say precisely that; but as the story of his book unfolds it becomes increasingly clear. Forced to resist the conclusions of modern science, for example, the church isolates its people from

the currents of contemporary thought. Preventing its people from reading the really significant books of our time, and denying them the opportunity of visiting Protestant churches, it makes it unavoidable that Protestants know more about Catholics than Catholics can possibly know about Protestants. Moreover, it is easy for an intelligent non-Catholic to know a very great deal more about the activities of the hierarchy than do most Catholic laymen. Such a situation will eventually be the church's downfall; and there must be thousands of intelligent Catholics who are aware of this.

Meanwhile, may this book be distributed far and wide. Let us not fear the charge of being anti-Catholic. American democracy can easily survive the many and varied religious beliefs—strange and absurd though they be—and regarding them we can be patient and understanding. It is not so certain, however, that democracy can emerge healthy and strong, unless the arrogant claims to economic and political power made in the name of a powerful religious hierarchy are promptly challenged and resisted.

Paul Blanshard has rendered the American people a great service. With his wide experience in dealing with the political arm of "The Church," and his great store of information, it is to be hoped that he will for the time being accept further writing as his educational task. It is to such leadership as he is able to offer us that we must look increasingly to keep the Catholic issue on a high, democratic level. Meanwhile, for better or worse, the issue must be faced without apology and without fear.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

Correspondence

Dr. Clark Responds to Editorial

TO UNITY:

On behalf of the Unitarian Ministers Association, I should like to thank UNITY and Curtis Reese for inviting discussion on the Resolution adopted in May on the ethics of performing professional services in the parish of a colleague. This and related matters are greatly in need of discussion among our ministers—and laity as well.

As president of the Unitarian Ministers Association I should like to think that I merely presided over this discussion to help the membership clarify and express its own point of view. Some incidental comments come to my mind which may or may not indicate an opinion on the resolution.

Reese's point of view seems to me to leave no question but that Humanists belong within the Unitarian fold. In fact, I feel sometimes that the Humanists are the real inheritors of nineteenth century Unitarianism and the bearers of that tradition. The most astonishing and persistent fact of Unitarianism is its intense individualism. To me this seems to be the individualism of America become self-conscious and applied to religion and personal morals. Parenthetically, this individualism may not be freedom, for atomism and freedom are not the same. Most Unitarians today invoke freedom by which they mean the right of the individual to veto any common effort. This is true of the theological right and the socio-political right which uses the word "free" in order, somehow, to preserve the emotional security of the church of their childhood where they confused Victorian austerity with rugged individualism. Humanism maintains this same intense individualism but maintains also the tradition of humanitarianism and of intellectual modernism which makes it more true to nineteenth century Unitarianism.

To Reese the funeral and marriage ceremonies are so personal that he would let nothing intrude, certainly nothing beyond the family. We admit that dying and getting married are both filled with consequence for the individual, but both are also of some consequence for the community. The ceremony in both cases is at least in part a community recognition of a person's change in status. To Reese the introduction of someone to this ceremony from beyond the family requires the closest personal relationship. So far as we are concerned this would bar ministers forever from marriage and funeral services because when the minister comes in he brings the community with him.

This is no new problem to the ancient Christian churches. When I was in New Orleans the Dean of the local Episcopal cathedral called me and demanded to know what our baptismal service was. I could only say it varied. Well, he wanted to know what words would be said in baptism, and I could only reply that these varied. At this frustration he explained that a boy christened in a Unitarian church was then in his office wanting to be married to a girl in his parish and that, of course, he could not be married until he had been properly baptized. Properly baptized meant having the words "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" said over one, and, as the Dean was at pains to explain to me, it made no difference who said it so long as it was said. St. Augustine had settled that long ago because, as I think I can still remember the Dean's words, otherwise it gets all mixed up in persons and the sort of persons they are.

The traditional church has erred in a complete institutionalism and in magical practice just as we are encouraged by the "individualists" now to err in the other direction and remove any significance beyond personal reference. The church has some standing in the ceremony as representing the community and the highest aspiration in the community; the church's official has some standing then as representing it. A minister is not in private practice like a lawyer or a doctor, a sort of spiritual healer who incidentally exhorts people in a body Sunday mornings at eleven.

I am one of those who does not believe in taking fees from a member of the church, since his support of the institution should entitle him to all its services. Paying the minister for a wedding is like mailing the mayor a check for sending out his fire department to save your house. The church might not have a minister but I dare say some member of the congregation would say a few words at one's funeral.

THADDEUS B. CLARK.

St. Louis, Missouri.

[The issue in this discussion, as I see it, is not what the minister brings to a ministerial service, but whether he must secure the consent of the parish minister to bring it. Nor does the issue have to do with free-lancing, for a minister by virtue of his ordination represents a fellowship larger than a local parish.—C. W. R.]

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

UNITARIAN APPEAL

The United Unitarian Appeal Campaign Planning Committee, which was made up this year of the executive officers of the participating organizations, decided at their meeting in June that the campaign this year should be conducted on a regional basis. Whereas in the past it has been operated entirely from Boston, the desire is to work toward a genuine "grass-roots" movement to support the various Unitarian agencies.

To carry out this idea in the Western Conference, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, president of the Conference, appointed a Conference Appeal Committee. This committee met at College Camp during the Lake Geneva Unitarian Summer Assembly. The committee is already working at the plans it laid out at its first meeting. The members of the committee are:

David Connolly, Rockford, Chairman
Randall S. Hilton, Secretary
Albert Bowen, Boulder, Colorado
John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Nebraska
Thaddeus T. Clark, St. Louis, Missouri
Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois
Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Howard B. Hauze, Chicago, Illinois
Helgi Borgford, Chicago, Illinois
Mrs. Robert Birdsall, Detroit, Michigan
Ellsworth Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio

The Conference has been divided into nine districts. A member of the committee is serving as chairman of each district. These district chairmen, the general chairman, and the secretary all stand ready to be of assistance to the churches in putting on their campaigns.

The Appeal goal this year of $275,000 is a "must" in order to maintain the minimum program and services of the Unitarian agencies. It has been estimated that the total cost of operating the participating agencies in the Appeal is approximately $700,000 or roughly $2,000 per church. The churches are only being asked for $275,000. This is easily within reach of Unitarians.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

The Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference attended the meetings of the General Conference of the American Unitarian Association in Portland, Oregon, August 15-18, 1949. Delegates from the Western Conference area included representatives from Denver, Detroit, Lincoln, Iowa City, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and St. Paul.

The Unitarian Church in Portland did a superb job of entertaining the General Conference. The first night the delegates were entertained at buffet suppers in the homes of members of the Portland church. Many of the delegates were guests in homes of members during the entire conference. Others occupied rooms in dormitories at Reed College. The sessions of the conference were held at Reed College. On the last day the Portland church took the delegates up to Timberline Lodge on Mt. Hood, providing transportation and serving tea at the Lodge. The crowd returned to Portland in time to attend the closing banquet at the Multnomah Hotel where Mr. Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court addressed the delegates and a nation-wide radio audience.

Two items which came before the business sessions of the conference are of especial interest. One was the unanimous passage of a resolution approving the steps suggested by the Unitarian-Universalist Joint Committee looking toward the merger of these two bodies. The second was the report of the Commission on Planning and Review. The first part of its report dealing with the functions of the commission aroused no particular comment. The second part dealing with the organization of the American Unitarian Association and the merger of all Unitarian agencies into the Association was the subject of some three hours of discussion. On the basis of the discussion, the attitude of the delegates was clearly opposed to the commission's recommendations. The only action taken was to refer the report to the Board of Directors of the American Unitarian Association with a transcript of the discussion. The discussion was taken down both by stenotype and wire recording. No recommendation of any kind was made to the board.

The General Conference elects the members of various committees and commissions. The following were elected:

Commission on Planning and Review (term, 4 years)
Rev. Raymond B. Johnson, Hingham, Mass.
Dr. Winfred Overholser, Washington, D. C.
Business Committee (term, 2 years)
David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois
Rev. Donald Harrington, New York City
Mrs. Danforth Lincoln, Milton, Mass.
David B. Parke, Buffalo, N. Y.
David W. Raudenbush, St. Paul, Minn.
Program Committee (term, 2 years)
Rev. Robert Killam, Cleveland, Ohio
Rev. Irving R. Murray, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Miss Marion H. Niles, Wellesley Farms, Mass.
Rev. Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo, Ohio
Mrs. Robert Poerheide, Peterborough, N. H.
Nominating Committee (term, 4 years)
Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago, Ill.
Frederick T. McGill, Jr., Short Hills, N. J.
Mrs. Russell P. Wise, Arlington, Mass.

The theme of the General Conference was "The Unitarian Answer to the Religious Challenge of the New Age." Rev. Josiah Bartlett, dean of the Starr King School for the Ministry, gave the theme talk. Starting with Bartlett's analysis of the characteristics and challenges of the new day to liberal religion, eight discussion groups held four "buzz" sessions on the subject. Among the definite proposals made was a recommendation to the officers of the Association that they call together liberal leaders of all fields to protect the basic civil rights of citizens and forward the principles of liberalism. There was a definite consensus for the need of liberals to band themselves together to prevent having their forces dissipated in disunity through fear of attacks from the totalitarian right and left.

LAKE GENEVA—1949

Three-hundred and eighty-three (383) Unitarians participated in the 1949 Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly held at College Camp on Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, August 29 to September 4. It was a happy and

enthusiastic crowd. The paeans of praise and commendation for the faculty and staff testified to the success of the conference.

Max Sonderby, editor of the *Castle Chimes* — the weekly paper of the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship, Chicago — in commenting on Geneva stated: "The conference has never failed, in the years we have attended, to revive in us that zeal to spread the word that in Other-Worldly Faiths sends missionaries to Africa. Determined as we may be, after lazy summer days, to resign all church jobs except ushering (which is the most fun), the first gavel of Dean Randall Hilton in the cupolaed Lewis Auditorium always sends us into a 10-month relapse. For the next seven days we eat and sleep church. . . . Perhaps the real influence that makes Geneva so deadly to one determined to place Dollars and Domesticity first and second in the coming year, is the fine people you meet there. From Boulder to Boston, Memphis to Minneapolis they come,— Friendly, Tolerant, Intelligent, Socially-Conscious, Truly walking ads for a Unitarian world."

SETBACK

The Geneva Conference which had been growing in numbers every year for eleven years suffered its first setback this summer. The 383 attendance was somewhat less than the 511 of last year. This resulted in a considerable financial loss to the Conference and a sizable deficit owed to the camp. Under the able chairmanship of Howard Hauze, the genial Director of Public Relations for the Conference, a Deficit Fund Drive was conducted among the delegates. The response was instantaneous and generous. Over five hundred dollars was raised. This plus the magnanimity of the faculty and staff in cancelling all or a large portion of their guaranteed travel expenses made it possible to liquidate the debt owed to College Camp. This left the treasury practically depleted with certain unsubmitted bills and the Fall planning meeting still to be financed. Contributions from individuals or churches will be greatly appreciated. Checks should be made payable to The Lake Geneva Summer Assembly. Such contributions may be sent either to Mr. Fritz Schaefer, 3323 Broadway, Indianapolis, Indiana, or to the Western Unitarian Conference office.

1950 ORGANIZATION

Three new members were elected to the Board of the Geneva Assembly. They were Howard B. Hauze, Chicago; Oscar Quimby, Cincinnati; and Mrs. Robert Lawson, Dayton. They filled places vacated by Mrs. Dudley Moore, Mr. William Hambley, and Mr. J. G. Princell, who had completed three-year terms and were ineligible for election.

At the organization meeting of the Board, Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., was elected chairman to succeed Mr. Hambley; and Oscar Quimby, vice-chairman, succeeding Mrs. Randall S. Hilton. Mrs. Bernard Heinrich was re-elected secretary, and Mr. Fritz Schaefer was re-elected treasurer. The offices of Dean and Registrar were held over to the next meeting of the Board, which is scheduled for November 27 and 28, 1949.

EARLY START

The annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference in 1950 will be held in Lincoln, Nebraska. The program committee has been appointed. It is composed of Rev. Philip Schug, Lincoln, chairman; Mr. Fred W. Putney, Lincoln; Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha; Rev. John W. Brigham, Sioux City; and Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Conference. The committee held a meeting during the Geneva Conference with all members present except Mr. Putney who asked Mr. Victor Seymour, Lincoln, to serve as his proxy. The tentative program is most interesting. The final program will be announced later. Plan to be at the meetings in Lincoln, April 28-30, 1950.

MAN OF THE WEEK

The City of Fort Wayne, Indiana, honors one of its citizens each week. During the third week in September the "Citizen of the Week" was Rev. Aron Gilmartin, minister of the Unitarian Society of Fort Wayne. This was by way of recognizing his many community services.

GEORGE W. STODDARD

Dr. George W. Stoddard, Moderator of the American Unitarian Association, President of the University of Illinois, United States member of the Executive Board of UNESCO, was appointed on September 10 to be the permanent chairman of the United States Commission on Education, Science, and Cultural Cooperation. He succeeds Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower.

EDWIN H. WILSON

Dr. Edwin H. Wilson became the Executive Director of the American Humanist Association on August 1, 1949. The permanent office of the Association was opened at 137 South Walnut Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio, on September first. Mr. Wilson will continue as editor of the *Humanist* magazine. Prior to becoming the Executive Director of the Humanist Association he was minister of the Unitarian Church in Salt Lake City, Utah. He also has served two Unitarian Churches in the Western Conference: Dayton and Third Church, Chicago. In June of this year the Meadville Theological School conferred upon Mr. Wilson the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS MEET

Rev. Ernest W. Kuebler, Executive Vice-President of the American Unitarian Association, called a meeting of the Regional Directors of the Association. This was the first of a series of meetings for the purpose of working out better cooperation and coordination between the Association and the Regional areas. The group met in Cleveland, Ohio, September 28 to 30, 1949.

DE WITT TESTIMONIAL

The Middle Atlantic States Council staged a Testimonial Dinner for the Rev. Dale De Witt on September 30. Mr. De Witt has completed ten years as Executive Director and Regional Director of the Council. Speakers at the dinner included Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Dr. A. Powell Davies, Dr. Frederick R. Griffin, and Dr. Warren B. Walsh.